



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mh

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,846	08/07/2001	Ariel Peled	01/22329	8637

7590
Martin D. Moynihan
PRTSI, Inc.
P. O. Box 16446
Arlington, VA 22215

02/28/2007

EXAMINER

BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/922,846	Applicant(s) PELED ET AL.	
	Examiner Yasin M. Barqadle	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 52-56, 60-64, 79-98 and 125-137 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 52-56, 60-64, 79-98 and 125-137 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 01, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on December 01, 2006 has been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

- Claims 4-51, 57-59, 65-78, 99-124 and 138-144 have been canceled.
- Claims 1-3, 52-56, 60-64, 79-98 and 125-137 presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. In essence the Applicant argues,

a) - "In contrast with the claimed invention, the disclosure of Parekh for determining, collecting, and using geographic locations of internet users is not based on real time information which is based on direct communication interactions with the user clients, but on records from a predefined database of geographic locations which is stored in a designated central location or in a related web site, see Parekh's Abstract." (Page 12, third paragraph).

b) - "Parekh does not teach or imply the network node data gatherer device of the claimed invention that is designed to obtain current information about the geographic location of the user," (page 12, last line to page 13 lines 5).

In response, the Examiner notes that Parekh teaches obtaining network node information during a direct communication interaction with a server. For example, Parekh "At 157, the user's 5 browser then executes the Java Applet, passing along the unique parameter tag. Since by default applets have rights to access the host from which they came, the applet on the user's 5 browser opens a direct connection to the client web

Art Unit: 2153

server 60, such as on, but not limited to, port 5000. The web server 60, such as through a separate server program, is listening for and accepts the connection on port 5000. At 158, the Java applet then sends back the unique parameter tag to the web server 60. Since the connection is direct, the web server 60 at 159 can determine the correct IP address for the user 5, so the web server 60 now can associate the session tag with that IP address on all future requests coming from the proxy server 38." (Col. 13, lines 34-47). Parekh further teaches "the web server 60 at 159 determines the IP address and geographic location of the user 5 when the Java applet connects to the web server 60." (Col. 13, lines 59-62). Therefore, Parekh clearly teaches determining the network node information of a user during current communication interaction between the user and the server.

Parekh also teaches a server program for listening and for accepting connections on specific ports, when connections are direct, the web server 60 for example can determine the correct IP address of the connecting user 5 (Col. 13, lines 34-47). This indicates contrary to applicant's arguments in pages 12-13 that Parekh does not teach a data gatherer being placed in a server.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1,55,79,80,89,96 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. "a network node data gatherer for obtaining... a network node information, said network node data gatherer being placed in said server". Examiner could not find a network data gather placed in a server that obtains a current location of a user during interaction with a client user. Applicant's remarks of December 01, 2006 state, "It should be noted that it is clear that the network node data gatherer is placed in the server from fig. 1 and the description thereof." Page 11, first paragraph. It is not clear

Art Unit: 2153

what data gatherer and what server in fig. 1 is the Applicant referring to.

Claims 1,55,79,80,89,96 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. "a network node data gatherer for obtaining... a network node information, said network node data gatherer being placed in said server". Examiner could not find "a network node data gatherer for obtaining, ... a network node information, said network node data gatherer being placed in said server."

Applicant's remarks of December 01, 2006 state, "It should be noted that it is clear that the network node data gatherer is placed in the server from fig. 1 and the description thereof." (Page 11, paragraphe one). It is not clear what data gatherer and what server in fig. 1 is the Applicant referring to. There is no item that is identified as a data gatherer in Fig. 1.

Claims 1,55,79,80,89,96 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the

Art Unit: 2153

written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. "said network node data gatherer is operable to intercept network node data from said Internet gateway following said request". Examiner could not find a network data gather placed in a server that is operable to intercept network node data from an Internet gateway following a request. Examiner notes the only time the word intercept or its equivalence is mentioned in the DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS section is paragraph [0207] "A user/client's request 401 for a service, that is to say a request for a transaction or other interaction as discussed above, is sent to the vendor etc. On the way it may be intercepted by a device or agent 402, which may typically be a hardware unit with sniffer-type software or the like, combined with an analysis program, the analysis program being specific to the geolocation purpose... provided that the method involves sniffing functionality that resides at the client's ISP 403." The paragraph mentions an intercepting device or agent, but it does not show a data gatherer operable to intercept network data that is placed in a server. Applicant is requested to clarify

Art Unit: 2153

what module in fig.1 or fig. 4 is regarded as the data gatherer. Examiner assumes data gatherer as the server receiving a request for information from a client.

Claims 1,55,79,80,89,96 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. "said network node data gatherer is operable to intercept network node data from said Internet gateway following said request."

Examiner notes the only time the word intercept or its equivalence is mentioned in the "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS" section is paragraph [0207] "A user/client's request 401 for a service, that is to say a request for a transaction or other interaction as discussed above, is sent to the vendor etc. On the way it may be intercepted by a device or agent 402, which may typically be a hardware unit with sniffer-type software or the like, combined with an analysis program, the analysis program being specific to the geolocation purpose... provided that the method involves sniffing functionality that resides at the client's ISP 403."

Art Unit: 2153

The paragraph mentions an intercepting device or agent, but it does not show a data gatherer operable to intercept network data that is placed in a server. Since data gatherer operable to intercept network node information in a server is not shown, it is not clear how it works. It is not clear whether the agent 402 is the data gatherer or the connectible object 110 in fig. 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

Art Unit: 2153

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-3, 55-56, 60-64, and 86-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parekh et al USPN (6757740).

As per claims 1, 55 and 96, Parekh et al teach the invention for determining a current location of a user client (fig. 13, 5) in an electronic interaction with a server (server 62) over a network having a plurality of nodes at different locations (fig. 6 and abstract), the apparatus comprising:

a network node data gatherer for obtaining from the current vicinity of said user client (user 5), during a direct communication interaction initiated by said user client with said server (server 60) and according to said direct communication, network node information "At 157, the user's 5 browser then executes the Java Applet, passing along the unique parameter tag. Since by default applets have rights to access the host from which they came, the applet on the user's 5 browser opens a direct connection to the client web server 60, such as on, but not limited to, port 5000. The web server 60, such as through a separate server program, is listening for and

Art Unit: 2153

accepts the connection on port 5000. At 158, the Java applet then sends back the unique parameter tag to the web server 60. Since the connection is direct, the web server 60 at 159 can determine the correct IP address for the user 5, so the web server 60 now can associate the session tag with that IP address on all future requests coming from the proxy server 38." (Col. 13, lines 34-47), said network node data gatherer being placed in said server "The web server 60, such as through a separate server program, is listening for and accepts the connection on port 5000. At 158, the Java applet then sends back the unique parameter tag to the web server 60. Since the connection is direct, the web server 60 at 159 can determine the correct IP address for the user 5, so the web server 60 now can associate the session tag with that IP address on all future requests coming from the proxy server 38." (Col. 13, lines 34-47), and a network node data correlator for correlating said network node information with a network node location map, thereby to provide said server with said current location for said user client (the collected information is stored in a database for analysis to determine the geographic location of a target host col. 10, lines 1-33; col. 11, lines 32-66 and col. 15, lines 39-64), where in said network node location map is a map of said network and said client network node information an identification of an

Art Unit: 2153

Internet gateway used by said user client, and said identification of said Internet gateway is an IP address of said gateway (see col. 7, lines 30-65 for the gateway 130.207.244.1 of the host 130.207.47.1), and said network node data gatherer comprises a request inducer unit for causing said user client to request a connectible entity from the server, and wherein said network node data gatherer is operable to intercept network node data from said Internet gateway following said request [user's browser is induced/directed to access a web page on the web server col. 13, lines 17-62; col. 16, lines 16-65 and col. 17, lines 48-54].

Parekh et al further teaches where the identification of the internet gateway is a DNS of said gateway col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 6, lines 39 to col.7, line 24).

As per claims 2 and 97, Parekh et al teach the invention, further comprising a digital media distributor associated with said network data correlator and operable to use said current location to govern digital media distribution to said user client [col.14, lines 12-26].

As per claims 3, 56 and 98, Parekh et al teach the invention, further comprising a location confirmation unit for separately

Art Unit: 2153

determining that said location provided by said client network node information is part of a current communication path to said user client [col. 7, lines 24 to col. 8, line 63].

As per claim 60, Parekh et al teach the invention, further comprising a host name assigner for assigning a host name to said connectible entity for each user client request, thereby to cause said Internet gateway to reveal its identity whilst attempting to locate said hostname [col. 7, lines 24 to col. 8, line 63 and col. 13, lines 6-62. see also col. 14, lines 1-12].

As per claim 61, Parekh et al teach the invention, wherein said host name is a unique host name for each user client request [user client hostnames are inherently unique in IP networks col. 1, lines 29-34 and col. 7, lines 24 to col. 8, line 63).

As per claim 62, Parekh et al teach the invention, said server comprising a master DNS, said master DNS being operable to give out to said user client an IP address upon requesting by said user client [col. 1, lines 45-59 and col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 6, lines 39 to col.7, line 24].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 63, Parekh et al teach the invention, said server further comprising at least one second DNS [col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 6, lines 39 to col.7, line 24. see also col. 9, lines 24-36].

As per claim 64, Parekh et al teach Apparatus according to claim 9, wherein said connectible entity is assignable a unique host name for each transaction request [col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 6, lines 39 to col.7, line 24. see also col. 9, lines 24-36].

As per claim 86, Parekh et al teach the invention, further comprising:

trace routing functionality for determining a network node distance and route of a user client by sending and attempting to receive response messages having varied time to live values [see ping and traceroute results in col. 6 and 7; col. 17, lines 47-58].

As per claim 87, Parekh et al teach the invention, further comprising:

combining functionality for combining trace routing from several locations to the user in order to enhance accuracy (col. 7, lines 24 to col. 8, line 63 and col. 15, lines 39-64].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 88, Parekh et al teach the invention, wherein said network node data gatherer comprises a connectible entity for carrying out trace routing to said server from said user client and sending results of said trace routing to said server [see ping and traceroute results in col. 6 and 7; col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 6, lines 39 to col.7, line 24].

As per claim 89, these claims include similar limitations as claim 1 and 55. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale. Further, Parekh et al teach a network node data gatherer comprising a software-agent (program) locatable at a network access node (col. 13, lines 23-62 and col. 15, lines 61 to col. 16, line 28).

As per claims 90, Parekh et al teach the invention, wherein said network access node is a digital network access node [see fig. 1 and 6].

As per claim 91, Parekh et al teach the invention where the digital network access node being a digital line access multiplexer [dial-up modem pool is used for accessing the Internet col. 6, lines 29-33 and col. 9, lines 53-63].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 92, Parekh et al teach the invention said network node being an Internet service provider comprising a plurality of servers and said network node data gatherer comprising functionality to determine additional information of said user client from an individual one of said plurality of servers with which it connects [fig. 8 and 13, col. 5, lines 18-41].

As per claim 93, Parekh et al teach the invention, said network node data gatherer being operable to obtain said additional information by correlating with a user database of the Internet service provider [col. 5, lines 18-41 and col. 8, lines 23-62].

As per claim 94, Parekh et al teach the invention, comprising a database builder for building a database of user client to correlate obtained location data with other data concerning said user clients [fig. 6,50 and fig. 13,80 and 90].

As per claim 95, this limitation includes similar limitations as claims 18, 93 and 94. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh et al USPN (6757740) in view of Rudinsky et al USPN. (20020090060).

As per claim 52, although Parekh et al shows substantial features of the claimed invention including obtaining client location information and the bandwidth used by the user, he does not explicitly show a line measuring unit for measuring connection line quality.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Parekh et al, as evidenced by Rudinsky et al USPN. (20020090060).

Art Unit: 2153

In analogous art, Rudinsky et al whose invention is about information collection device in a communications networks, disclose a data collection device for measuring connection line quality [¶ 45]. Giving the teaching of Rudinsky et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Parekh et al by employing the system of Rudinsky et al because it produces useful data for determining the physical line quality.

As per claims 53, Rudinsky et al teach the invention where the line measuring unit comprising a connection comparison unit for comparing line qualities of different connections [¶ 10 and 95-98].

As per claims 54, Rudinsky et al teach the invention qualities being one of a group comprising: signal to noise ration, specific frequency attenuation, end path delay, echo characteristics, delay variance, and compression artifacts [¶ 118-119].

7. Claims 79-85, 125-129, and 133-137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh et al USPN (6757740) in view of Mashinsky USPN. (6088436).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 79, 80 and 134, although Parekh et al shows substantial features of the claimed invention as explained in claim 1 above, he does not explicitly show confirming a contact via a telephone number by giving a user an identification for looping using a user client and a connection made using the telephone number.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Parekh et al, as evidenced by Mashinsky USPN. (6088436).

In analogous art, Mashinsky whose invention is about a network of telecommunication nodes using automated callback system, discloses a system confirming a contact via a telephone number (user telephone number is compared to a list of authorized telephone numbers stored in authorized user database) by giving a user an identification for looping (callback) using a user client and a connection made using the telephone number [authorized user database 829, fig. 8 stores the account numbers, passwords, and telephone numbers of individuals authorized to access on-line services Col. 19, lines 41 to col. 20, line 66]. Giving the teaching of Mashinsky, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Parekh et al by employing the callback system of Mashinsky in order to minimize

Art Unit: 2153

the cost of connecting authorized customers to an on-line service [col. 19, lines 25-28].

Mashinsky further teaches a request for a user telephone number [col. 54-65].

As per claim 135, Mashinsky teaches the invention, further comprising an authentication unit operable to obtain a modem telephone number of said user client, thereby to attempt to establish contact with said user client [col. 20, lines 1-43].

As per claims 81, Mashinsky teaches the invention, further comprising an authentication unit contactable by the modem of said user client, thereby to attempt to establish contact with said user client [col. 20, lines 1-43].

As per claim 82, this claim has similar limitations as claim 31. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale.

As per claims 83 and 136, Mashinsky teaches the invention, said authentication unit being operable to send authentication information via said connection for return via said network connection [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 84 and 137, Mashinsky teaches the invention, said authentication unit being operable to send authentication via said network for return via said direct connection [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

As per claim 85, Mashinsky teaches the invention, said authentication unit being operable to send authentication via said network for return via said direct connection [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

As per claim 125, this claim has similar limitations as claim 79. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale. Parekh further teaches digital media distribution associated with a network data correlator (col. 3, lines 32-41).

As per claim 126, Mashinsky teaches the invention, further comprising an authentication unit operable to obtain a modem telephone number of said user client, thereby to attempt to establish contact with said user client [col. 20, lines 1-43].

As per claim 127, Mashinsky teaches the invention, further comprising an authentication unit operable to obtain a modem telephone number of said user client and to determine that

Art Unit: 2153

contact is established with said user client using said given modem number [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

As per claim 128, Mashinsky teaches the invention, said authentication unit being operable to send authentication via said network for return via said direct connection [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

As per claim 129, Mashinsky teaches the invention, said authentication unit being operable to send authentication via said network for return via said direct connection [col. 20, lines 1-43 and col. 21, lines 10-51].

As per claim 133, Mashinsky teaches the invention comprising an interface for interfacing to a telephone number resolving systems, thereby to obtain service level conditions associated with particular telephone numbers [fig. 1 and 6].

8. Claims 130-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh et al USPN (6757740) in view of Mashinsky USPN. (6088436) and further in view of Rudinsky et al USPN. (20020090060).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 130, although Parekh and Mashinsky show substantial features of the claimed invention including obtaining client location information and the bandwidth used by the user, they do not explicitly show a line measuring unit for measuring connection line quality.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Parekh and Mashinsky, as evidenced by Rudinsky et al USPN. (20020090060).

In analogous art, Rudinsky et al whose invention is about information collection device in a communications networks, disclose a data collection device for measuring connection line quality [¶ 45]. Giving the teaching of Rudinsky et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Parekh and Mashinsky by employing the system of Rudinsky et al because it produces useful data for determining the physical line quality.

As per claim 131, Rudinsky et al teach the invention where the line measuring unit comprising a connection comparison unit for comparing line qualities of different connections [¶ 10 and 95-98].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 132, Rudinsky et al teach the invention qualities being one of a group comprising: signal to noise ration, specific frequency attenuation, end path delay, echo characteristics, delay variance, and compression artifacts [¶ 118-119].

Conclusion

9. The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Art Unit: 2153

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)..

YB

Art Unit 2153


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER